



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,594	03/18/2002	Stefan Uhrlandt	215742US0	7653
22850	7590	06/15/2004		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER MANLOVE, SHALIE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1755				

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/098,594

Applicant(s)

UHRLANDT ET AL.

Examiner

Shalie A. Manlove

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/02
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Groups I and II are combined into new Group I
2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 4/26/2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that (1) restriction is improper because claims of the restricted groups are not independent or distinct, (2) there is no undue burden to search, and (3) that reasons must be provided to support the restriction. This is not found persuasive because a separate classification of groups wherein groups are products or methods or methods of using are distinct and require a different search which presents prima facie evidence of a serious burden to the examiner, and support for the restriction is provided by the patents cited by applicant which teach silica have different uses and therefore the restriction is proper and maintained.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Claims 24-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/26/2004.

Information Disclosure Statement

The examiner has considered all related applications cited in the IDS filed 3/21/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

Art Unit: 1755

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-15, 18-19, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uhrlandt et al US 6,702,887

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Table I and Examples 1-3 teach two silica fractions that differ by at least 10.5% in the value of BET and 30% in value of DBP absorption, wherein silica particles have an average diameter of 180 microns, wherein a portion of one silica fraction in the silica ranges from 50% by weight, wherein the silica fractions are mixed in the dried state as reported in example 6, and wherein one or more silica fractions comprise a precipitated silica prepared by precipitating a silicate with an acid and the resulting precipitation suspensions or filter cakes are mixed as taught in examples 4 and 5.

Claims 7-9 and 11 are product by process claims. PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS CLAIMS ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE MANIPULATIONS OF THE RECITED STEPS, ONLY THE STRUCTURE IMPLIED BY THE STEPS

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process

Art Unit: 1755

claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable

even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777

F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-3, 6-15, and 18-23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,613,309. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both disclose a silica and process of making comprising at least two silica fractions that differ by at least 10% in at least one value of BET or CTAB surface area or DBP absorption and wherein the silica particles have an average diameter of more than 80 microns. The reference suggests industrial application of silica in dental care and an abrasive paste composition. However, it is notoriously well known to use silica as carrier material.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,702,887. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both disclose a silica and process of making comprising at least two silica fractions that differ by at least 10% in at least one value of BET or CTAB surface area or DBP absorption and wherein the silica particles have an average diameter of more than 80 microns. The reference suggests industrial application of silica as fillers in elastomers. However, it is notoriously well known to use silica as carrier material.
5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reinhardt et al US 5,110,574 teaches a process of producing synthetic precipitated silicas.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shalie A. Manlove whose telephone number is (571) 272-1372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 6:30-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark L. Bell can be reached on (571) 272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1755

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shalie A. Manlove
Examiner
Art Unit 1755

June 9, 2004


C. MELISSA KOSLOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER